Reply to Office Action of September 17, 2010

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, and 16-18 are pending in the application. New claim 18 has been

added

Terminal Disclaimer

The terminal disclaimer filed on January 30, 2009 was not entered because the signee's

name is not printed on the terminal disclaimer.

In view of this, a terminal disclaimer signed by the attorney whose name is printed

thereon has been submitted herewith.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve and enter the terminal disclaimer, and

reconsider and withdraw the Double Patenting rejection.

Double Patenting

Claims 8 and 10 have been provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory

obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10, and 11 of

copending application No. 10/550,002.

In view of this, a terminal disclaimer has been submitted herewith to overcome this

rejection.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve and enter the terminal disclaimer, and

reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

(a) Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ando et al. (JP 2001-276484) in view of Mueller et al. (USP 5,504,955), in

Application No.: 10/535,247 Docket No.: 2936-0241PUS1
Reply dated December 15, 2010 Page 8 of 12

Reply to Office Action of September 17, 2010

view of Kown (US 2002/0088061), in view of Hashimoto (USP 5,743,115). This rejection is

respectfully traversed.

a. Combination of the cited references does not make the claimed subject matter

obvious

According to the present invention, it is found that, "for a sufficient amount of metal ions

to be absorbed in laundry, time is required that is longer by a certain degree than the time

required for a treatment substance such as a softening agent to spread all over the laundry."

Accordingly, a configuration is adopted in which "a predetermined process in a laundry washing

session is performed longer than in a case where no metal ions are added but a treatment

substance is added." As a result, the following benefits are obtained: a sufficient amount of metal

ions attaches to laundry to exert a sufficient antimicrobial effect; by contrast, when a treatment

agent alone is added, a laundry washing session takes less time, allowing more efficient handling

of household chores.

Making the time required by "rinsing with addition of metal ions" and the time required

by "rinsing with addition of a treatment substance" different in this way is not obvious to one

skilled in the art even if he combines together the "ringing with addition of silver ions,"

disclosed by Ando, the "rinsing with addition of a treatment agent," disclosed by Mueller, and

the "spin dry rinse cycle repeated three times," disclosed by Hashimoto.

b. The "spin dry rinse" in Hashimoto does not correspond to the "rinsing" of the

present invention

The spin dry rinse shown in Figs. 4 and 5 and described in col. 6, line 26 - col. 6, line 5 of

Hashimoto involves spin-drying at 100 rpm for 1 minute with supply of water and spin-drying at

Docket No.: 2936-0241PUS1 Application No.: 10/535,247 Page 9 of 12

Reply dated December 15, 2010

Reply to Office Action of September 17, 2010

100 rpm for 2 minutes. This spin dry rinse cycle is repeated three times, with a ten-seconds' period with the motor off intervening between consecutive cycles.

Thus, the "spin dry rinse" in Hashimoto involves no period at all in which a water current occurs, and thus does not correspond to the "rinsing" of the present invention.

Further, whereas the rinsing in the present invention is for "attaching metal ions or treatment substance to clothes effectively," the spin dry rinse in Hashimoto is for "extracting detergent from clothes effectively." These are thus technically quite opposite.

Claims 4, 5, 7, and 16, dependent on claim 1, are allowable at least for their dependency on claim 1.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Claims 8, 10, and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ando in view of Hashimoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

(Claim 8)

The timing of the "water-fed unbalance recovery" of Hashimoto differs from that of the present invention

It is clear that G15 and G16 in Fig. 3 of Hashimoto are performed after a washing process (G3) and before a rinsing process (spin dry rinse processes G19-G23). They are thus not performed after final rinsing as recited in claim 8.

According to claim 8 of the present application, when metal ions are added in final rinsing, drainage of the metal ions is prevented through correction of imbalance during squeezing.

Docket No.: 2936-0241PUS1 Application No.: 10/535,247 Page 10 of 12

Reply dated December 15, 2010

Reply to Office Action of September 17, 2010

In the first place, performing imbalance correction before a rinsing process (spin dry rinse

processes G19-G23) as in Hashimoto does not solve the problem addressed by claim 8 of the

present application (i.e., preventing drainage of the metal ions added in a rinsing process).

Even if "rinsing with addition of silver ions" of Ando is combined with "water-fed

unbalance recovery" of Hashimoto, the silver ions attached to clothes in the "water-fed

unbalance recovery G15 and G16" of Hashimoto are all drained off in the "spin dry rinse G19-

G23" performed later in Hashimoto.

Claim 10, dependent on claim 8, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 8.

(Claim 17)

The timing of the "water-fed unbalance recovery" of Hashimoto differs from that of the

present invention

As discussed above in connection with claim 8, the timing of the "water-fed unbalance

recovery" of Hashimoto differs from the timing of imbalance correction in the present invention

recited in claim 17.

In addition, according to claim 8, when metal ions are added in final rinsing, instead of

reducing the consumption of metal ions by not adding them in water-fed imbalance correction

during squeezing, the user is notified that the antimicrobial effect by the metal ions may be

weakened.

Even if "rinsing with addition of silver ions" of Ando is combined with "water-fed

unbalance recovery" of Hashimoto, the silver ions attached to clothes in the "water-fed

unbalance recovery G15 and G6" of Hashimoto are all drained off in the "spin dry rinse G19-

G23" performed later in Hashimoto.

Application No.: 10/535,247 Docket No.: 2936-0241PUS1
Reply dated December 15, 2010 Page 11 of 12

Reply to Office Action of September 17, 2010

Thus, in the first place, combining Ando with Hashimoto does not allow metal ions to

attach to clothes, and accordingly does not suffer from the problem addressed by claim 17 of the

present invention (i.e., when the consumption of metal ions is reduced, the user is unaware of a

possible reduction in the antimicrobial effect by metal ions).

In view of this, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this

rejection.

New Claim

Claim 18, dependent on claim 1, is allowable at least for its dependency on claim 1.

A favorable determination by the Examiner and allowance of this claim is earnestly

solicited.

Conclusion

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the

rejections and objections, and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Maki Hatsumi, Registration No.

40417 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to

expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

 Application No.: 10/535,247
 Docket No.: 2936-0241PUS1

 Reply dated December 15, 2010
 Page 12 of 12

Reply to Office Action of September 17, 2010

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: December 15, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By ((eg.# 40,417)

Charles Gorenstein
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000

Attachment: Terminal Disclaimer